DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 372 UD 020 094

AUTHOR	Truesdell, Lee Ann
TITLE	Funded Programs and Comprehensive Planning.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Div. of Funded Programs.
PUB DATE	May 79
NOTE	96p.; Not available in paper copy due to reproduction quality of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role: *Educational Coordination; Elementary Secondary Education: Federal Aid; Program Administration: *Program Coordination; School Districts: *School Organization: *Special Programs; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I: *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

Students participating in special programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act may experience a fragmented and disjointed instructional program. Case studies of ten schools in New York City were conducted to identify the ways in which special programs were coordinated with classroom instruction. Summaries of the case study data include information on instructional goals, school organization, special programs, coordination of instruction in the schools, staff training, district coordination of instruction, parent advisory councils, and concerns about special programs stated by district and school personnel. Factors which influence program coordination at the district and school levels are also discussed. Constraints on instructional coordination, particularly those related to school organization, are examined. Recommendations for change at the Federal, State, district, and school levels are made. (RLV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FUNDED PROGRAMS AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

ED182372

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Lee Ann Truesdell
Center for Advanced Study in Education
Graduate School and University Center
City University of New York
for
New York City Board of Education
Office of Funded Programs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R Edmonds
NYC Bd of Ed
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD020094

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreward

Acknowledgments

Introduction i

Procedures 11

Summary of Findings 15

- Summary of Case Study Data
  - Goals
  - School Organization
  - Special Programs
  - Coordination of Instruction in the Schools
  - Training
  - District Coordination of Instruction
  - Parent Advisory Councils
  - Concerns
- Factors that Influence Coordination
  - District Coordination
  - School Coordination
- Constraints on Instructional Coordination
- Same Additional Findings

Recommendations 27

Questions 31

References 33

Appendix

Case Study A 35
B 42
C 50
D 55
E 63
F 68
G 72
H 77
I 81
J 86

FOREWORD

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was approved by Congress to provide compensatory education to economically deprived students. This legislation, of which Title I is the largest part, was the first of many special programs funded by the state and federal government to enhance or supplement local education. Today, students may participate in several special programs, and as a result, may experience a fragmented and disjointed instructional program. Students who participate in special math or reading programs for instance, also participate in reading and math programs in their regular classroom. These instructional programs are seldom coordinated, and some may, in fact, do more harm than good.

The New York State Education Department has become aware of the need to coordinate special programs better. New state regulations require school districts to design a comprehensive plan for Title I and state compensatory (PSEN) programs. The Office of Funded Programs in the New York City Board of Education requested that a study be conducted to examine the ways in which schools and community school districts coordinate instruction. The study will be used to help community school districts and schools develop and implement comprehensive planning.

May, 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Case studies of ten schools in New York City were conducted to identify the ways in which special programs were coordinated with classroom instruction. The study was completed in ten weeks so that information could be provided to districts to assist them in designing a comprehensive plan for compensatory programs for the 1979-80 academic year.

I want to thank the members of the New York City Board of Education, Office of Funded Programs, community school districts personnel and the staffs of the ten schools who responded on very short notice to requests for documents and interviews.

I am especially grateful to Dr. Perry Davis, Director of the Office of Funded Programs, Dr. Rosemary Salomone, and Mr. David Sherman, Director of the Special State and Federal Programs Unit who helped to conceptualize the study and assisted in contacting community school superintendents.

I also want to thank the members of the Proposal Development Task Force, Mr. Jack N. Allen, Mr. Kenneth Roff, Mrs. Shirley Genn, and Mrs. Miriam Ross who assisted in interviewing school personnel.

An initial draft of the report was reviewed by Dr. Alan Gartner, Director of the Center for the Advanced Study in Education, Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York, Dr. Marvin Taylor, Professor of Education, Queens College, and Mr. Marvin Barondes, Director of the Bureau for Proposal Development, Office of Funded Programs. Their critique and encouragement is greatly appreciated.

I want to thank Mrs. Martha N. Matos, Ms. Eloise M. Sprance and Mrs. Elaine Sisken in the Office of Funded Programs for their support in typing and printing this document. Despite the constraints of time, they remained cheerful and accommodating throughout the entire project.

L. A. T

INTRODUCTION

Concurrent with regular classroom instruction, many New York City students participate in one or more special programs. There is often a lack of coordination between ongoing classroom instruction and instruction that takes place in the special programs. The majority of special programs focus on remediation of basic skills for specified populations of students. Recently, both the State Education Department in its Resource Allocation Plan of July, 1978 and the New York State Regents Advisory Council in its Report of the Basic Skills Working Group of October, 1976 expressed concern over the fragmented, uncoordinated way in which remedial programs are implemented by schools. The net effect may be student confusion leading to the further retardation of pupil acquisition of basic skills.

The New York City Board of Education has recognized this problem and described the fragmentation of instruction in a recent proposal to study federal program guidelines and their effect on comprehensive planning.

> Each program constitutes a different source of income. Different offices administer each program. There is no effective coordination of the uses of funds at the central level. Law prohibits commingling of funds from the various programs. In the school students are scheduled to participate in special programs in order to preserve the funding source's independence of other school funding. Children are isolated by programs in which they participate....

If a student is targeted for participation in a number of different funded programs, his or her school experience may become so compartmentalized that it loses cohesiveness.

In some schools and community school districts, fragmentation of instruction is reduced by efforts to coordinate special programs with the ongoing classroom programs. Coordination may occur when classroom and special program instruction is designed to achieve district and/or school goals or when special programs have objectives similar to classroom instruction. Coordination of instruction may occur when a special program teacher and a classroom teacher share space and/or responsibility for teaching. Coordination may also be achieved when pedagogical staff of special programs and regular classrooms receive training in the same strategies, methods, or curriculum. And coordination often results when the responsibility for special program administration is delegated to a curriculum coordinator for classroom instruction, as when the Title I reading program is supervised by the district's reading coordinator.

The extent to which students participate in a unified set of learning experiences depends upon the coordination of the classroom instruction and special programs that occurs within the school. Coordination is often affected by the decision-making process of the district. For example, when proposals for the funding of special programs are written with input from curriculum coordinators, principals, and classroom teachers, program objectives may be coordinated with district and/or school goals; provisions may be made for articulation between program and classroom teachers, and training may be designed so that classroom teachers and special program teachers participate in the same or

a similar staff development program. The special programs, however, are usually designed by district personnel. Teachers and principals frequently are not involved in planning or developing proposals and programs. Special programs remain separate from ongoing school instruction because the principal and classroom teachers often lack the overall perspective of the supplementary programs, their origins or their purposes. Coordination is further constrained by the organization of the school. Teachers are given sole responsibility for the instruction of an assigned group of students. Time for instruction is dictated more often by the district's need to fulfill union contractual agreements rather than by the learning needs of students. Traditional models of school organization provide little time for interaction between teachers or for joint planning.

The coordination of instruction for students who participate in special programs that are supplementary to their classroom experiences must be carefully orchestrated through program design, program administration, and school organization. Funding for special programs represents a significant portion of the instructional expenditure in New York City. Many students in a majority of the city's schools participate in special supplementary programs. Therefore, in the spring of 1979, the Office of Funded Programs of the New York City Board of Education requested that a study be conducted to explore and identify ways in which special programs may be coordinated with ongoing classroom instruction so that support may be provided to districts and schools which seek to increase an effective coordination of special programs with classroom instruction.

The nature of the study was exploratory. Rather than testing a set of hypotheses, the study was conducted to identify issues and questions for further, more extensive study. The study was not conducted to find out whether funded programs were implemented within state and federal guidelines. A subsequent study will examine gudelines and regulations to explore alternative designs for program implementation. This limited study only describes what is currently happening in ten New York City schools. The unit of investigation was the school. The administration and coordination of special programs was examined in ten New York City schools and their respective community school districts. Descriptions of the ways in which special programs were implemented in the school were drawn from interviews conducted with school and district personnel. Variables which seem to influence implementation and coordination of instruction in each school were identified.

It is assumed that better coordination of special programs with classroom instruction will contribute to higher student achievement. Common sense seems to dictate that students will attain a higher level of achievement when they participate in a well coordinated set of instructional programs that work in harmony toward attaining clearly articulated and agreed upon objectives. While there is very little research that measures the effects on performance of student participation in multiple programs, an analysis of school social structure variables and their effects on achievement has indicated that emphasis on differentiated programs for different students is associated negatively with achievement (Brookover, et al, 1978).

It is well known that achievement is influenced by the amount of time students are actively engaged in learning (Wiley and Harnschfegu, 1974; Carroll, 1963). Samuels and Edwall (1977) found that the processes by which students learn and the context in which instruction takes place also influence reading achievement. They found that components of several successful compensatory programs were either organizational or instructional.

The organizational variables were:

1. strong administrative leadership,
2. cooperation and involvement of staff in planning and coordinating reading programs, and
3. placement of fiscal resources in personnel rather than facilities to achieve acceptable teacher-pupil ratio (some programs used teacher aides and reading specialists).

The instructional variables were:

1. instruction divided into subskills or units with a sequenced phonics component,
2. individual pacing and mastery, and
3. constant feedback and a diagnostic evaluation program.

Samuels and Edwall (1974) report further that, in a comparison of two New York City schools conducted by the New York State Department of Education there was better organization of reading time in the more effective school. Teachers were required to understand and use various supplemental and compensatory programs and activities, whereas in the comparison school, teachers were unfamiliar with these programs and activities. Also the less successful school lacked planning for the total educational experience of its students. This lack of coordination contributed to

friction among staff members. In the successful school, there was a school-wide effort to plan the teaching of reading.

Sarason found in his studies of schools that teachers do not have a decision-making role with respect to variables that affect life in the classroom; the teacher has little say about the numbers and diversity of children in their classroom or the time perspective by which his/her teaching is governed. Teachers experience feelings of dissonance as a result of the lack of coordination of school programming. This dissonance is compounded by the guilt that teachers feel in not being able to help students with learning difficulties. They feel that they do not have enough time to reach and understand children and that they do not have adequate knowledge and skill to help all children (Sarason, 1969). Teachers seek to dissolve some of their discomfort by admitting that certain children cannot be accommodated in the ordinary classroom. Sarason found that the segregation of problem children is the prepotent response to the professional and personal dilemmas that teachers face.

Sarason observed that coordination of a school's program relies on the role and perceptions of the principal. The isolationist behavior of the principal contributes to the lack of participatory decision-making in the school. The principal assumes that he or she alone must attempt to resolve problems. The behavior of the principal is further influenced by his or her perceptions of the expectations of the school system. According to Sarason, the diversity among principals is due to the fact that some principals act as if they are primarily in control of their destiny and others act as if their behavior is largely a function

of external conditions. Diversity among principals is determined by the principal's conception of himself in relation to the system and how this conception is powered by ideas and values. (Sarason, 1969).

In a 1977 position paper on the role of the principal, the National Institute of Education (NIE) pointed out that policy planning and decision-making are traditionally carried out by superintendents and school boards and the principal is the implementer of policy and district-made decisions. NIE reminds the reader of Sarason's discussion of change. Any propcsal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily upon the principal, and those perceptions of the system may limit the principal's action. In a memo to superintendents and others in 1973, Irving Ratchick, New York State Assistant Commissioner for Compensatory Education, stated, "A key ingredient - perhaps the most important ingredient to success in compensatory education projects operations is the early, direct, and continuing involvement of building principals."

According to Berman, et al (1974), there is a need to study the ways in which programs are implemented and the institutional setting in which a program operates in order to identify the variables that influence the effectiveness or the degree of change brought about by the funded program. Federal and state compensatory programs are a challenge to the educational system since they imply that the status quo is inadequate in some respects and that local change is needed.

Sarason noted that change will usually follow the line of least resistance and personal trouble. The introduction of special programs to

a school creates the need for a certain amount of change. Schools must adapt in some way to the added ingredient. Therefore, when special programs are placed in a school, they often are not included within the overall school organization but rather are placed as appendages, remaining outside the school's framework and having little influence on the schooling process.

The coordination of bilingual programs and school instruction must also be considered as the variety of programs and number of participating students increase in the New York City public schools. A brief examination of the literature on bilingual education indicates that there is concern about the lack of coordination among bilingual programs. A discussion of coordination and articulation between bilingual programs and school instruction is lacking. The nature of bilingual education in New York City ranges from bilingual self-contained classes to resource rooms available for small group instruction and for teachers' use in their efforts to educate students who are other than English speaking. Bilingual classes are established when there are sufficient numbers of students within an age span who speak the same language. John-Steiner and Cooper (1976) describe bilingual and bicultural education as teaching and learning in and through two languages. They point out that bilingual programs currently in existence vary greatly. The transitional model at one end provides for instruction conducted in both languages until such time when the student has attained sufficient mastery of English language skills in order to function in the mainstream. A trend in New York City is to maintain bilingual classes through the high

school. Some bilingual programs are reciprocal, offering English language dominant students instruction in bilingual classes. It is an important development with wide-ranging implication for the future of bilingual education and cultural pluralism in the schools (John-Steiner and Cooper, 1976). The variety of programs is due in part to the fact that bilingual education is funded by several sources, each having a different set of guidelines. liams (1978) reports that these programs are at different points on the transition/maintenance continuum and it is difficult, therefore, for school systems to know what all the possibilities and stipulations are in order to determine the best sources of funding for its bilingual students.

A cursory glance at the literature on compensatory program reveals that a great deal of effort has been expended to evaluate them while very little energy has been devoted to acquiring a better understanding of what processes have contributed to their success or failure. Attention to the ways in which special programs are coordinated with classroom instruction may reveal that students are participating in programs that are contrary in nature or out of step with classroom instruction. Special program implementation may be affected by the school's organization and the perceptions of teachers and of the principal. Further, it is thought that the design of the program should provide for articulation. Teacher and other staff training in the special program is also thought to facilitate program implementation and coordination. The following organizational and instructional variables in the New York City schools were examined in order to

describe coordination of special programs with classroom instruction: (a) district and/or school instructional goals, (b) district and/or school organization, (c) district and/or school decision making processes, (d) special program design, (e) staff development, and (f) efforts by individual district or school personnel.

PROCEDURES

This study is but a brief glance at the ways in which special programs are functioning in the New York City schools. Ten schools were selected out of a total of 634 elementary and intermediate schools operated by the 32 community school districts. The schools were not chosen at random but rather were selected to represent all five boroughs and ten different districts. Selection was made from among schools having a median population of between 600 and 900 students. Schools were chosen so that different combinations of programs were represented. One school, for instance, did not have any Title I programs but did have several other special programs. Another school was designated a bilingual school. Three schools were selected because they are known for their success in reading and math achievement or because of unique programming. In one case a school did not wish to participate because of their testing schedule and another school in the same district was substituted. All the data pertaining to each school are presented in case study format. The reader should note that this small number of schools is not sufficient to be considered a representative sample of the city's schools and therefore, the summary of findings is not generalizable to all New York City schools.

Sources of data within the Central Board of Education, in the literature, in the districts and in the school were identified. Questions were compiled and organized into major areas of investigation. Data collection procedures and instruments were designed and implemented. Analysis of documents and interview protocals resulted in the compilation

of data for each school that described the ways in which the programs and instruction co-exist. The entire study was conducted in ten weeks. This severe time constraint required that the study narrowly focus only on issues relating to program interaction and coordination. Many factors that may influence program design and implementation were not examined. Budgets, personnel selection, history of the school, student characteristics, community, and factors within a school that are difficult to identify in a single visit are not represented in this cursory glance. The special programs included in the study were those funded under Title I New York State, Pupil with Special Education Needs (PSEN) legislation, the Emergency School Aide Act (ESAA), as well as bilingual programs and transitional classes.

Data collection began by contacting each administrative unit within the New York City Board of Education to collect information about the nature of each special program. Information about specific district programs was collected and used to design interview schedules for use in community school districts and schools. The case studies were developed by compiling data from interviews conducted in the school and at the district office. Interviews were conducted in the ten district offices and at three school sites by the project director. Two teams of two staff members from the Office of Funded Programs conducted interviews in the remaining seven schools. At each school site, interviews were conducted with the school principal, teachers of special programs, regular classroom teachers who have students participating in special

programs, other school personnel involved with the functioning of special programs in the school such as assistant principals, and coordinators and, when possible, a parent of a child in a special program. In the district offices, interviews were conducted with the superintendent, the director of funded programs, persons responsible for the implementation of curriculum and instruction, and special program coordinators. In each school and district office, interviews were conducted with as many people as possible given the extremely short notice that superintendents and principals had to make arrangements. A single visit was made to each district office. A return visit was required in three districts in order to interview a sufficient number of staff. The school visits by teams of two interviewers permitted the principal some flexibility in arranging for teacher interviews within the confines of the school's schedule.

In the ten community school districts, interviews were conducted with nine superintendents, four deputy superintendents, nine directors of funded programs, fifteen reading coordinators, three math coordinators, seven bilingual coordinators, and other district personnel. In the ten schools, interviews were conducted with all ten principals, four assistant principals, thirteen reading teachers in funded programs, one math teacher, seven bilingual teachers, three other special program teachers, one transitional teacher, sixteen classroom teachers and seven parents. In all, 125 interviews were conducted.

Interview schedules were developed for each role type, reviewed by persons in the Office of Funded Programs and two faculty members in the CUNY system, and field tested at a school site and district office. Revised interview schedules were used in the remaining nine schools and district offices. The four persons who conducted interviews in the schools were trained by the Project Director. Assignments were made so that these persons went to schools with which they had had no previous contact. The Project Director and members of the interview teams were experienced teachers and/or school administrators and were familiar with funded programs.

Data used to develop each case study included interview protocals, documents describing programs, training and school activities, and program proposals. The data were organized into the general categories of:

a. district or school goals, focus of instruction, or comprehensive plan;
b. school organization;
c. descriptions of the special programs found in the school;
d. interaction of special programs and school instruction;
e. staff development;
f. district effects on school program implementation;
g. parent participation;
h. concerns about and suggestions for changes in special programs as stated by district and school personnel.

Descriptions of the interaction and coordination of special programs with school instruction are presented for each school in the Appendix.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A discussion of the data compiled in the ten case studies is organized in four parts. The findings are summarized in the first section in terms of district and school goals, school organization, special programs, school coordination, training, district coordination, parent involvement, and concerns. The second section describes the organizational and programmatic factors which were found to influence coordination of special programs with classroom instruction. The third section discusses constraints that inhibited coordination and the fourth section presents some additional findings related to schooling in New York City.

Summary of Case Study Data

Goals. District and school personnel who were interviewed throughout the ten districts said that their primary goals were to improve reading and math achievement in their schools. Two districts provided the interviewer with written goal statements that included goals for schooling and learning beyond the acquisition of basic skills. Three districts had unwritten but clearly agreed upon goals known to district and school personnel. Persons interviewed in two districts said that school individuality was recognized. Each school in these two districts was encouraged to develop its own philosophy, goals and organizational plans.

Of the ten schools visited in this study, two provided written goals, one school was in the process of developing a comprehensive plan to improve reading, and three schools appeared to have a focus or theme

that guided their organization and planning.

School Organization. The sample of schools included eight elementary and two intermediate schools. The organization of these schools varied from open space to self contained and from multigraded heterogeneous grouping to homogeneous grouping by reading level. Self-contained classes with heterogeneous grouping was the predominant pattern of school organization. In some schools, students were regrouped homogeneously for reading and/or math instruction and, in two schools, students were homogeneously grouped for all instruction. The two intermediate schools were departmentalized and one maintained homogeneous grouping for all instruction.

Special Programs. The special programs observed in the ten schools included Title I, PSEN and ESAA funded reading and math programs; bilingual and ESL programs funded by tax-levy, New York State, Title I and Title VII; and transitional classes which are supported by city and district funds. Most of the reading programs were funded by Title I and were of a pull-out design in which some students from a class receive supplementary reading instruction in a separate classroom. Many schools had several supplementary reading programs. Nine schools had some form of a reading pull-out program. Three schools provided supplementary reading instruction in classrooms. One school scheduled entire classes to use the reading lab where the classroom teacher supervised non-targeted students. There were only four supplementary math programs and they were all of a pull-out design. In one of these schools, the math lab teacher also worked with some targeted students in their classrooms. Two schools were designated

bilingual and there were bilingual classes in four of the other schools visited. Bilingual instruction for major subject areas was conducted for entire classes. ESL programs were often of the pull-out design. Title VII resource teachers were located in seven schools where they provided coordination for the bilingual programs and assisted teachers in securing and developing instructional materials. ESAA programs were found in four schools. They included three pull-out reading programs and one dance program for bilingual-bicultural education.

Coordination of Instruction in the Schools. Formal efforts to coordinate instruction was found in only one of the ten schools. Principals and teachers in most schools described coordination as an informal process of interaction between special program teachers and classroom teachers. Formally scheduled joint planning time for program and classroom teachers were found in only two schools and jointly planned instruction occurred in only one of these two schools. Classroom teachers in two schools accompanied their classes to special programs and participated in the teaching-learning situation. In five schools, special program teachers periodically gave written records to the classroom teachers of the diagnostic data or skills being taught in the special program. In one of the six schools housing bilingual classes, the bilingual teacher met with other teachers on a regular basis to discuss student progress and instructional programs.

Training. Monthly meetings for special program teachers are held in each district as part of the program's teacher training component.

Teachers do not attend these meetings, as they are held during the school day. However, training programs for classroom teachers in seven districts did correspond with a special program. In four districts the classroom teachers were being trained in a diagnostic prescriptive approach used in their school's Title I math labs. In three of the seven districts, individual classroom teachers were selected and trained by the district and functioned as resource persons to support the implementation of special programs within the school. Training of principals and assistant principals occurred in three districts to facilitate the implementation of a new program in the district's schools or to provide training and support to special program and classroom teachers. One district funded a teacher's learning center with state compensatory funds.

District Coordination of Instruction. Districts achieved some overall coordination by assigning the direction of special programs to a curriculum coordinator for the same subject area of instruction. In seven districts, reading and math coordinators directed the Title I programs. Cutbacks in recent years have left some districts without curriculum coordinators funded by tax-levy resources. As a result, directors of special programs have become curriculum resource persons for the district. The development of proposals for special program funding is almost always carried out by a small cadre of district supervisors. The programs are designed to provide supplementary instruction often given in a location separate from the student's regular classroom. Special programs that provided for structured articulation between the program teacher and

the classroom teacher were found in only three districts.

Parent Advisory Councils. Parents are not directly involved in designing special programs. Proposals are submitted to the district's Parent Advisory Council for approval before they are presented to the school board. Parents who were interviewed were not aware of efforts by school and district personnel to coordinate instruction.

Concerns. Many district and school personnel voiced concern about the pull-out design used in most special programs. They stated that guidelines and regulations are rigid and that there are few alternatives to a pull-out design. Districts are required to account for the instruction of targeted children. Auditing of program operations by state monitors requires an easily identifiable program. Therefore, most districts design programs so that upon inspection, they are clearly separate from classroom instruction. It was pointed out in several interviews that special programs have divers guidelines. Districts find it difficult, therefore, to coordinate special programs with one another. Those who were interviewed also found that special programs require an inordinate amount of paper work and a very time-consuming evaluation process. Testing, conducted in the fall, and delayed funding contribute to late program implementation, often resulting in a six week loss of instructional time. Many districts and schools are reluctant to initiate program implementation when funds have not actually been received. Persons who were interviewed stated that funding schedules should be adjusted to coincide with the school's fiscal year.

Factors that Influence Coordination

District Coordination. District-wide goals influenced the design of special programs and their coordination with classroom instruction. In districts where goals had been established, special programs were designed to support goal achievement (see Case Studies B, D, E and H in the Appendix). In the schools where coordination was most extensive, the design of special programs at the district level provided for articulation and coordination. For example, in District D, the Title I and PSEN reading programs are designed so that classroom teachers and special program teachers jointly plan instruction. Training for classroom teachers and principals was found to be a key ingredient in program and instructional coordination. Persons interviewed in Districts D, E and H stated that training for principals was essential in the achievement of district goals. It was also felt in many districts that training for classroom teachers in the methodology and content of special programs greatly enhanced communication between classroom and special program teachers. In Districts D, E and H, one teacher from each school participated in a district training program linked to a special program. These teachers provided information, support and resources needed to implement the special program in their schools. The training programs operating in Districts D and H were designed to achieve district goals and were directly linked to classroom instruction.

Some degree of coordination was also achieved at the district level when district personnel were responsible for both classroom instruction

and special programs. In many districts, the reading coordinator also directed the Title I reading programs. However, district coordination was not always evident in the school. Coordination resulted when the district supervisors expected coordination of special programs and classroom instruction within the schools and supported the efforts of school personnel.

School Coordination. Articulation between classroom teachers and special program teachers was found in schools that had established a set of goals or an instructional focus (Schools B, D and G). These three schools had been included in the sample because they were considered successful schools. Each principal appeared to exert strong leadership and two of these schools had special programs that were designed for articulation and coordination with classroom instruction. It is difficult, therefore, to know what combination of variables contributed to the observed coordination. School organization in each of these three schools supported their goals or instructional focus. For example, School D achieved its goal to reduce class size for reading instruction by regrouping all students homogeneously and distributing the groups among all the school's teaching personnel for reading instruction. Supplementary reading programs supported the developmental reading program by providing instructional services that were related to the students' classroom experiences.

The organization of School H supported the goal to promote independent learning and research skills. A rotating schedule of classroom

and library time allowed students to research and collect information for their independent projects and review their progress with the classroom teacher. Those students who needed additional instruction in reading participated in a parallel program for supplementary reading (see School H, Appendix). In Schools D and H, the organization of time, students, resources and personnel were structured to support the instructional program.

In most schools, special programs were conducted separate from the regular classroom. Teacher interaction, program articulation and joint planning occurred when school and/or district supervisors expected and supported coordinated instruction. Coordination of bilingual programs was observed where a supervisor or resource teacher exerted a unifying force in the school. In the two bilingual schools, C and E, coordination was carried out between the bilingual teachers and other classroom teachers. The bilingual schools had a unifying philosophy for their bilingual program that was not found in the other schools with bilingual classes.

In summary, a coordinated instructional program was found in schools that had established goals or an instructional focus, where the principal exerted strong leadership, where special programs were designed to include an articulation process, where school organization facilitated teacher interaction, and where coordination was expected and supported by school and/or district supervisors. Coordination at the district level occurred where goals had been established, where special programs were designed for articulation with classroom instruction, when classroom teachers and principals received training in the content and

methodology of the special programs and where special programs and classroom instruction were administered by the same person.

Constraints on Instructional Coordination

The case studies described the ways that schools and districts coordinate programs. The study also revealed some constraints that inhibit or prevent program coordination. The prepotent factor is school organization. Teachers have little opportunity to plan together because teaching and learning is almost always organized so that a single teacher instructs a group of students. The school's schedule seldom provides for joint planning time between classroom teachers and reimbursable teachers. Most of the schools divide instruction into 45 minute periods to accommodate coverage schedules.

A second constraint is the difference in the rules or working conditions for tax levy and reimbursable teachers. Special program teachers have fewer students to instruct and usually have more planning time. Only recently have administrative duties been delegated to special program teachers. They may attend training sessions outside the school building by cancelling their classes for all or part of a day. Coordination is inhibited when school district personnel narrowly interpret the federal and state guidelines. Special programs are designed so that there is no overlapping of instruction in order to prevent accusations of possible supplanting of tax levy instruction.

It is not surprising that it is difficult to find coordination among special programs and with classroom instruction within a school. The state and federal guidelines for funded programs are not uniform and there are a multiplicity of programs. Bilingual education, for example, may be funded with Title I, Title VII, ESAA, state and local

monies. Programs for reading may be funded by Title I, ESAA and PSEN.. Each of these programs has a different set of guidelines that specify different criteria for student selection and conditions within which instruction must occur. The role of the city and state is perceived by district personnel as administrative and evaluative. Each program bureaucracy watches its own program.

Some Additional Findings

The nature of an exploratory study is such that issues related to the inquiry's purpose surface along with those central to the study's focus. A brief discussion of these additional findings is presented either because the issues are of great concern to district and school personnel or because the writer believes that they are important in the overall scheme of things.

Testing of students in New York City public schools is substantially out of proportion to any rationale that may support testing as an instructional device. Separate standardized testing is conducted by the city and state at different times of the year. The testing is duplicative and the results are not used to design instruction. Many districts have begun their own criterion-referenced testing programs and are coordinating them with the instructional programs found in their schools. Citywide criterion-referenced testing is now mandated for the 1979-80 school year and districts are reluctant to give up the systems they have designed and in which they have invested time and resources. In discussing student selection criteria and program implementation with district and school personnel, it became apparent that a student who is eligible for remedial and/or bilingual programs may

participate in several weeks of testing in a given school year. Much of the testing is used to design instruction and some of it is used for political, allocation or programmatic gate-keeping purposes. Citywide testing is mandated by the New York State decentralized law and may be used to identify those schools that are eligible to select teachers outside the seniority system. This mandate may have been meaningful in a time of increasing enrollment, but is found to be of little use to districts in a time of declining enrollment. Eligibility for excluding bilingual students from citywide testing is determined by their performance on the LAB test. Those students who score below the tenth percentile are excused. This criteria is disparate with criteria for inclusion in bilingual programs where 20% is the cutoff level. Those students who score between the 10th and 20th percentile are eligible for bilingual education but are still required to be tested in English. Lack of coordination of testing results in duplication, diverts attention and time from instruction (probably a significant percentage of the school year's prime instructional time), and costs money that may be spent more wisely on instruction.

Despite the low level of coordination between special programs and classroom instruction, there is a slow but steady movement to introduce the diagnostic-prescriptive design of instruction to the regular classroom. The forces of competency testing, accountability and government funding are influencing change in classroom instruction. Classroom teachers feel they will be held accountable for the competency of students as demonstrated on these tests. Some districts are expanding their diagnostic testing to include all students. The influence of funded programs on instruction is

enhanced by funds available for program design, purchasing of materials, and training. This influence is most apparent in the training conducted at the district and school level. It was found that few classroom teachers participate in any district-level training. But when schools or districts implement instructional changes in schools, they often call on the expertise of the funded program personnel to help design and implement staff development programs. The designs of these programs are heavily influenced by the diagnostic-prescriptive model of instruction.

There is very little coordination of programs with ongoing classroom instruction. Fragmentation occurs at every level and there is little effort by districts or schools to look at the total instructional picture. Special programs remain separate when there is no expectation for their integration. The organization of schools does not accommodate coordination. The study of ten schools illustrates the wide variance in the ways that schools are organized. In some schools, special programs remain outside the primary organization, while other schools are organized around special programs so that it appears as if the tail is wagging the dog. The highest level of coordination is achieved where schools are organized to support articulation and coordination of instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The unit of study was the school. Recommendations, therefore, focus on school change. However, there are outside factors influencing special program implementation in the school that must also receive attention. The first discussion will suggest change for federal, state and city regulations and policies.

Guidelines at the federal and state level must be carefully analyzed and revised to support instructional coordination. Targeted students must be assured that their education is cohesive and that concepts and skills are introduced and reinforced at the appropriate time and sequence. Funding cycles must be adjusted to coincide with the school calendar. Precious instructional time is lost when the implementation of funded programs is delayed. Districts are reluctant to hire paraprofessionals and order materials until they have the resources to do so. There is a move to combine testing so that student identification and program evaluation occur at the same time. This change would reduce the number of tests administered, reduce the cost of testing, and increase the instructional time for funded programs. In some of the schools visited during this study, instruction in special programs did not usually begin until the middle of October, resulting in a six-week loss of instructional time.

The State Education Department and Central Board of Education of the City of New York must change their role in relation to funded programs. Lengthy procedures and incredible amounts of paper work are a drain on school and district personnel. District personnel report that they must maintain detailed records and collect and compile statistics for city

and state agencies that they do not need or use in their own planning. The city and state should carefully examine what is required of districts to acquire and maintain funded programs. In addition to monitoring programs, the Central Board of Education should expand its role of assisting districts to design and coordinate instruction.

Because schools do not operate in a vacuum but rather are part of a community school district, the following recommendations are made for district level change. Districts must attend to program coordination. Articulation and joint planning must be considered in program design and in the organization of district staff. District-wide goals must be developed to guide the decision-making. Program coordinators, curriculum coordinators and school principals should be included in participatory decision-making related to instruction and program implementation. The district superintendent should establish the expectation for cohesiveness, articulation and coordination.

Within the school, the principal should be an instruction leader as well as an administrator. The school's organization should reflect its goals and facilitate communication among programs and among teachers. The possibilities for using time and school personnel in unique and creative ways are endless. Most schools divide up instructional time into 45 minute periods to accomodate union contractual agreements. Instruction is organized so that most subjects are taught every day for short periods of time by one teacher. In other words, school organization--steeped in tradition--dictates instructional design. It is suggested here

that instruction should dictate the school organization.

Teachers should participate in school decision-making and collaboratively design and implement instruction. The importance of this recommendation cannot be overestimated. Teachers must have ownership for what is happening in their school and have influence over critical factors that affect their teaching. If they are going to be held accountable for their students' achievement, then teachers must design and organize their students' instruction.

Teacher training cuts across city, district and school levels. Training was described by most persons interviewed as those meetings held by district-level coordinators once a month for teachers of funded programs. The meetings deal with administrative matters, review instructional materials, discuss procedures such as testing and selection of students, and provide a forum for sharing among the program's teachers. Classroom teachers do not participate. Another form of training occurs as teacher trainers funded by the various programs work with the teachers of their special program in the school. On occasion they may be asked to assist regular school personnel with a particular problem, e.g., selection of new materials or test instruments. It appears that most training takes place for program teachers and not classroom teachers. Few of the teachers interviewed reported that they had participated in any district training in the last few years. Each district has a great deal of teacher training expertise that may be used in an expanded school-based teacher training effort focused on school-wide instructional problems and program implementation. The city's role could be one of technical assistance. Teacher

trainers could be trained in those skills needed to be effective school-based teacher educators.

Change in a school requires the active participation and leadership of the principal. In two case studies it was found that an effective strategy for implementing new programs in schools began with training for the principal and assistant principals. A training program for principals that assists them in program design and coordination is recommended. Training of principals must include personnel, consider the uniqueness of each school, and provide technical assistance to help schools build cohesiveness from the coordination that already exists.

Questions

This study set out to identify the ways in which schools and districts in New York City coordinate special programs with classroom instruction. A second purpose was to identify the issues and questions related to program coordination that may be used to guide subsequent inquiry. The most fundamental issue concerns effects on achievements.

-What effect on achievement results when students participate in special programs?

There is very little research that has examined student achievement for those students who participate in several special programs and consequently experience fragmentation of instruction. Special programs, especially compensatory education programs, will continue to be part of the total instructional experience of many students in New York City. It is important, therefore, to find out how to coordinate special programs with classroom instruction.

-What combination of organizational and instructional variables are needed to effect instructional coordination?

Articulation and instructional cohesiveness must be considered in the design of special programs and in the organization of schools. To these ends the following questions are presented:

-How should special programs be designed so that they may be coordinated with classroom instruction?

-How should schools be organized to facilitate the coordination of special programs with classroom instruction?

It is incumbent upon educators to explore how special programs and schools can support joint planning and cohesive instruction.

REFERENCE

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M.W., Pauly, E.W. and others. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. I, A model of educational change (September 1974) Rand Corporation. Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education, D.H.E.W., Contract 1589/1-5-HEW, Santa Monica, California: April, 1975.

Brookover, W.B., Schweitzer, J., Schneider, J., Beady, C., Flood, P.K., and Wisenbaker, J. Elementary School Climate and School Achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 1978, 15 301-330.

Carroll, I.B. A model for school learning. Teachers College Record, 1963, 64 723-733.

Iiams, T.M. The gatherning storm over bilingual education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59 226-230.

John-Steiner, V. and Cooper, E. Recent trends in bilingual education. New York, New York: Columbia University, 1976 (ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, ED 128-504)

The Role of the School Principal in School Desegregation. A Position Paper. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (DHEW) 1977. (ERIC Document ED 141-932)

Samuels, S.J. and Edwall, G. School Characteristics: Qualities of Schools That are Associated with Reading Achievement in A Study of the Focus and Nature of Reading Problems: Final Report. Guthrie, J.T., Samuels, S.J., Martuza, V., Seifert, M., Tyler, S.J. and Edwall, G. Newark, Deleware: International Reading Association, 1976 (ERIC 127567)

Sarason, S. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Wiley, D.E. and Harnschfeger, A. Explosion of a myth: quality of schooling and exposure to instruction, major educational vehicles. Educational Researcher, 1974, 3 (4), 7-13.

APPENDIX

TEN CASE STUDIES

SCHOOL A

Goals and/or Instructional Focus

The focus of School A is on performing and visual arts. The school organizes the student body for student participation in the arts program of their choice. Students are expected to achieve academically, as well as improve in their talent area. The school's curriculum is academically oriented and offers a wide variety of performing and visual arts classes.

School Organization

School A is an intermediate school for grades 6 through 9. Sub-schools within the school focus on particular talent areas such as band, chorus, dance, and visual arts. Students are assigned to heterogeneous classes within a sub-school and attend their arts, physical education, shop, typing and social studies classes together. Students are homogeneously grouped for English, math, science, Title I and bilingual classes. The school's organization allows students who are targeted for special programs to participate with the other students in academic and minor subjects. Administration of school programs and instruction is assigned to three assistant principals who have both vertical and horizontal responsibilities. They supervise a grade level and curriculum areas. For the purpose of this study it is important to note that, the AP who supervises English also supervises the Reading Labs. The teachers in each subject area have common preparation periods which facilitates communication among teachers across grade levels within a department. In some cases teachers informally plan together in small groups. Reading

teachers, however, are teaching while English teachers are planning and are unable to attend staff meetings or jointly plan with English teachers.

Special Programs

There are several special programs functioning within this school. This study focused on the reading program and the bilingual class. The reading program consists of two reading labs, staffed by four teachers and two paraprofessionals. One lab serves 6th and 7th grades and the other serves 8th and 9th grades. The teachers work in both labs as a four member team. The labs have a diagnostic/prescriptive orientation but differ in the way students engage in learning and in the materials available. Students in the 6th and 7th grade lab participate in direct teacher directed instruction in small groups. The 8th and 9th grade lab is a modified High Intensity Learning System (HILS) lab. Several Title I reading programs visited during this study had adopted the HILS Reading lab because its management system is keyed to most commercial materials. The HILS lab also places great emphasis on the reading of books. The labs are amply supplied with a wide variety of trade books and students discuss their readings with the lab teacher on a regular basis. In School A, the 8th and 9th grade students proceeded individually in the HILS reading lab. This lab model was selected by the reading teachers after they observed labs in other schools.

Students attended the labs four times a week in homogeneous groups while other students in their sub-school attended foreign language classes. Because the school is departmentalized the reading program is not a

"pull-out" but rather a regularly scheduled class. Thus, a student has no class to return to when he or she no longer needs remediation. As one teacher said, "The scheduling hooks kids in!" A second drawback to the school's organization is that students are scheduled to the reading lab by sub-school unit rather than by common skill needs. This results in a wide range of skill ability within each class attending the lab.

There is a single bilingual class for Spanish speaking students in this school. The students are assigned to a heterogeneous group within their sub-school and attend major subject area classes with the bilingual teacher. They also receive one period of English each day. Students who attend classes with the bilingual teacher are mainstreamed as their English language facility improves or upon parent request. However, it was noted that students in bilingual classes rarely return to regular classes. All students are assigned to a sub-school, participate in a regular homeroom and attend minor subjects taught in English.

Coordination in the School

Within School A the formal interaction of the reading program and the English Department occurs as a result of having a common supervisor. Although reading and English teachers do not have regularly scheduled meetings, there is interaction via the informal communications network of the school. One of the reading teachers previously taught English in the school, is familiar with the English courses, and is known to members of the English staff. Bilingual education and teaching reading in the content areas have been the subject of recent school-wide staff meetings.

A conference on dyslexia, organized by the reading teachers, was held for the faculty in April. The curriculum for English is clearly different from what is taught in the reading lab. The departmentalized organization of the school insulates the reading teachers and bilingual teacher from their colleagues just as it prevents the teachers in one department from planning or jointly teaching on a regular basis with teachers of another department. The reading teachers felt, however, that subject area teachers sought their advice about individual students, shared information, and consulted with them as reading resource persons.

Within the reading program there is a high level of interaction among the four reading teachers. Although there are two reading labs located in different parts of the building, the four teachers and two paraprofessionals work as a team, teach interchangeably in the labs and coordinate the use of materials. This coordination occurs even though two teachers are funded by Title I and two are funded by PSEN.

Interaction and coordination at the district level occurs as a result of placing the administration of special programs with the district's curriculum coordinators. Members of the district staff described their roles as that of resource persons available to the schools for consultation and assistance. As an example, schools often select learning materials after consulting with the reading coordinator about the characteristics and qualities of the materials. The bilingual coordinator has directed the design of many bilingual teaching materials and has established a resource center in the district.

Training

Staff development occurs for the reading teachers once a month at the district office and is conducted by the reading coordinator. These meetings often deal with administrative matters and do not focus on improving teaching skills. Title I meetings are held during the school day, thereby prohibiting the attendance of classroom teachers. District curriculum coordinators included teacher training in their role description. They said that training occurs with individual teachers and with grade level or departmental groups at the school.

In this district, staff development also occurs in connection with two programs not implemented at School A. Funding from a gifted and talented grant pays substitutes so that intermediate science teachers may attend training at the New York Academy of Science. The coordinator of a Reading Through the Arts Program demonstrates reading instructional techniques using arts media. Teachers accompany their class to a resource center to observe the coordinator reinforce reading skills while involving the students in arts activities. The coordinator works for several weeks in one school in order to get to know the teachers and children and to follow up demonstrations by helping teachers in their own classrooms.

Parent Advisory Council

Parents are involved in approving proposals for school and district funding. Two parents from School A participate on the district Parent Advisory Council (PAC). Alternative proposals for Title I are developed

at the district office incorporating the suggestions of schools and considering district-wide needs. The model selected by most schools is presented to the district PAC for consideration and then presented to the community school board. During the school year, parents observe Title I classes and complete observation sheets provided to the school from the district office. In School A additional parent involvement occurred when it was discovered that there were very limited instructional resources for the reading labs. They actively sought and acquired additional resources from the district office.

Concerns

Several concerns were expressed by district staff about funded programs. Prekindergarten programs are no longer available under Title I and there is a need for such classes in some district schools. Funded programs, particularly Title I, need to provide greater flexibility to promote school-wide classroom activities. Supervisory personnel are not fundable in some programs, yet they are required to supervise the program teachers. District staff expressed the desire to limit classroom registers rather then pull children out to participate in supplementary programs. School staff are extremely supportive of the reading lab and wish to replicate the lab model for math and science. Additional funding was desired to expand the bilingual program, increase the number of classes of foreign languages offered, expand the anthropology and pre-law courses and offer gifted and talented programs during the school day. Other monies are needed to train a pool of teachers as specialists

in their field and to allow them time to design and develop instructional materials.

The coordination of regular school instruction and special programs in School A occurs through an assistant principal and district level coordinators. Articulation of programs takes place between regular school staff and special programs staff via the informal school communications network and in staff meetings.

SCHOOL B

Goals

The goals of District B reflect a statement found in the district's annual report regarding the severe cutbacks of 1976.

> Fiscal austerity has resurrected a concept among some educators which demands confrontation; a differentiation between "basics" and "frills". There are no educational frills; not only must every pupil in every school in the District receive instruction to develop and improve skills in reading and mathematics, but every pupil in every school in the District must receive opportunities to develop interests and skills in the arts and the humanities.

Among the district's goals are individualized instruction, district support for school level delivery of services, and the following goal which speaks directly to special programs:

> to enrich the delivery of educational services by seeking and implementing special programs to reflect special needs and to overcome the alienation demonstrated by some students.

The district's support for this goal was then described in its annual report:

> The basic tax levy instructional program in a general sense has been the focus of our attention; this is as it should be. Interwoven in the fabric of basic instructional services, however, are those other instructional programs we sometimes consider as being separate and distinct, and as having identities apart from basic services. We refer to these programs as Funded Programs.
>
> In actuality, these programs are neither separate nor distinct, but are integral and complementary to the basic instructional services in the District for specific target populations with specific educational needs as identified within the context of the funding source guidelines.
>
> The Superintendent intends to seek out programs and resources to exploit the strengths, interests, and abilities of pupils, and to motivate and generate reading activities. The arts - painting, sculpture, dance - represent one such opportunity.

The nature of the funded programs found in School B reflects the district's effort to provide an educational experience which provides for the acquisition of basic skills and the exploration of knowledge through the environment with emphasis on the arts.

School Organization

School B is a K-6 elementary school with a population of 33% Hispanic, 23% black and 44% white. Half of the students live outside the immediate neighborhood because parents who move choose to keep their children enrolled in this school. Students are organized heterogeneously in multigraded classes. The open education concept has been implemented in more than half of the school's 29 classes. Five classes are bilingual. The principal and two administrative assistants manage the school and supervise the personnel. There are several Title I programs, a PSEN funded reading clinic, an ESAA dance program, bilingual classes and several other special programs. Some of these programs are pull-out while others take place in the classroom. The principal schedules school-wide activities and student participation in special programs. Teachers describe the organization of special programs as being comprehensive and serving those children with the greatest need. Teachers establish their own classroom schedules around the school's activities.

The special programs in School B are selected and reviewed by the school's advisory board of classroom teachers, parents and district staff. New programs are developed when parents and teachers identify needs,

consider school goals and select priorities. The emphasis in this district is on school level options. The school implements programs to meet its needs and the principal has full responsibility for those programs within the school. Although the district emphasizes the use of paraprofessionals in its Title I program, the school may choose to have a reading teacher and fewer paraprofessionals. The district initiated a criterion-referenced testing program. Some schools elected to test students outside the Title I target population.

Special Programs

There are several components of the Title I program in School B. One component provides for a reading teacher who sees targeted students in a pull-out situation. The reading teacher also assists classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in planning for additional students who remain in their classrooms. Paraprofessionals instruct small groups and individual students in reading and math under the direction of the classroom teacher using prescriptions developed by the reading resource teacher in conjunction with the classroom teacher. A second component is a phonics oriented reading program taught 25 minutes each day by classroom teachers. The reading staff meets monthly to plan the program for implementation by the classroom teacher. Title I also partially funds a creative writing program for targeted students who demonstrate a special talent or interest in writing yet have reading problems. Teachers and parents attend workshops designed to help them conduct the special writing classes.

A PSEN reading clinic also functions in each of the district's schools. A clinician and consulting professionals identify and diagnose severe learning problems. Services in nearby hospitals are also used to identify physical problems that may be impeding the student's acquisition of reading skills. Funded by PSEN, the program provides a complete diagnostic work-up; individual prescriptions are developed and remediation is begun by the reading clinician. A period of clinical teaching is conducted to identify the learning and teaching strategies which work best for the child. The process culminates in a clinical report to guide the student's teachers. The district maintains a follow-up program to assure that teachers continue to meet the student's special needs. Reading clinic services are available for monolingual and bilingual students.

Bilingual education in School B includes both bilingual classes and ESL instruction. Several open education oriented classes are organized as multigraded units for both Spanish dominant and English dominant students. English as a Second Language (ESL) classes meet twice a week as a pull-out program. Bilingual paraprofessionals also assist in classrooms.

The ESAA program found in School B is designed to enhance the programs offered in the classroom. Dance, music, language and ecology are themes found in the district-wide multicultural program. School B selected a dance program to extend classroom instruction. The classroom teacher and ESAA teacher discuss concepts and units being studied in the classroom. The ESAA teacher develops a set of objectives for skills,

vocabulary and human relations activities that focus on the unit. The classroom teacher accompanies the entire class to the dance oriented program twice a week.

School Coordination

Special programs in School B are coordinated by the principal. One teacher said that it was difficult to discuss the programs individually because they were considered as a total school programmatic thrust through which the special needs of students were accommodated. Each of the programs in School B included in this study have design characteristics that foster articulation between the classroom teacher and the programs' teachers and contribute to coordination of instruction for children. The Title I reading teacher instructs some Title I eligible students in a pull-out program and informally discusses student progress with the classroom teacher. Another group of targeted Title I students are instructed by paraprofessionals in the classroom under the direction of the classroom teacher using prescriptions developed by the reading teacher. Paraprofessionals plan frequently with the classroom teacher. The phonics program relies on the classroom teacher to implement instruction designed by the reading staff. As part of the reading clinic program, the clinician provides information to the student's teacher with suggestions for appropriate instruction. Continued support and follow-up to the classroom teacher is maintained as long as the student requires special instruction. Weekly planning sessions between the program teacher and the classroom teacher are held to coordinate the ESAA

program with classroom instruction. The class is taught by the ESAA teacher, assisted by the classroom teacher and a paraprofessional. Planning time and common lunch period for grade level teachers facilitates grade level coordination.

Training

Many of the programs described in the previous paragraphs are supported by a variety of training efforts offered by the district and nearby universities. The district has two jointly sponsored learning centers (district, PSEN and university) that offer workshops and school-based training and provide a place for teachers to design instructional materials. It is open to teachers, paraprofessionals and parents. Training was conducted by the Title I director to introduce principals and Title I teachers to criterion-referenced testing. The ESAA program requires that the ESAA teacher work with the classroom teacher to develop objectives for instruction and evaluate student performance. Two teacher trainers work closely with ESAA teachers to help develop skills and strategies that correlate with the instructional objectives and to locate appropriate resources within the district that may be used in the lessons.

District Coordination

The role of the district staff in the coordination of instruction in School B is to establish goals that reflect the community's expectations for education, to secure and make resources available to schools to achieve these goals, and then to place the responsibility for their achievement with the school and its principal. The district staff

assists schools in program implementation.

Parent Advisory Council

School B has a long history of active and supportive parent involvement. Parents are part of the ongoing decision-making process of the school. An advisory council, comprised of a teacher, a paraprofessional, the principal and parents, decide which programs are to be implemented and monitor program activities. The Title I PAC chairperson had indepth knowledge of all the school's programs. She is a member of the school's parent association executive committee and is presently enlisting support for the maintenance of Title I programs in the school. Parents are directly involved in the clinic program.

Concerns

Concerns expressed by district personnel include the rigidity of state guidelines for Title I that prevent creative programming. The large amounts of paperwork and layers of monitoring further limit the human resources available for program implementation. There was concern also, that teachers who work with Title I paraprofessionals should meet daily to coordinate instruction. School level concerns focused on the narrowness of the guidelines that restrict flexibility in school programming. Insufficient time is available for long range comprehensive planning for special programs because funds are available on a yearly basis and are awarded just prior to school opening. It was felt that the insecurity caused by the uncertain continuation of programs has impact on effectiveness.

School B approaches the integration of special programs with school instruction by coordinating special programs together and by matching

special needs of students. Some of the programs are designed in such a way that classroom teachers and program teachers come together in the program's implementation. Common planning time for grade level teachers helps the informal coordination process. Teachers and parents believe that students benefit from their participation in special programs. They believe that skills and attitudes about school are improved. The principal feels that the special programs unify the school because children have the opportunity to get to know each other in a variety of settings.

SCHOOL C

School C is located in a district that fosters individuality among its educators by assisting and supporting their efforts to design unique programs for entire schools or for groups of students within one or more schools. The district is highly decentralized. Some of its 30+ funded programs have a strong district-wide focus, while others are designed for a particular school or group of students. There are several alternative schools that reflect the interests and philosophy of a single individual or group of educators. Alternative schools cut through the traditional structures of school and grade levels, are led by strong individuals who set high standards and expectations, and have unique instructional designs that reflect its philosophy and the needs of students. Programs in some of the alternative schools are supported by outside funding. Staff members of the district's office of funded programs assist school personnel in writing proposals. They also design district-wide programs to provide for the special educational needs of students that take advantage of the creativity within and unique characteristics of the district and its schools. Extensive needs assessments are conducted in the district to support a wide variety of proposal writing efforts.

School Organization

School C is a bilingual elementary school, K-6. Writing is used throughout school instruction as a "vehicle for encountering the world." The number of bilingual classes has increased in the past few years. This year the school has shifted from a school with a cluster of bilingual classes to one unified bilingual school. Each grade has one English

dominant class and one Spanish dominant class. There is a multigraded gifted class for every two grades. Grouping is heterogeneous within each class for subject area instruction. The school day is divided into 45 minute periods with the first and sixth periods reserved for language instruction. The principal schedules cluster teachers. Participation in Title I is scheduled by the principal, classroom teacher and Title I teacher.

Special Programs

The special programs operating in School C are Title I reading, Title VII, a Title I bilingual learning disabilities program, a transitional class and a PSEN program. This year the Title I reading program throughout the district is focusing on comprehension and study skills. Teachers are using direct teaching rather than managing individualized instruction. In School C the reading teacher said that more reading skills are being taught, there is a greater variety of activities, and the students find the program more interesting than the previously used decoding skills oriented program. Only Title I targeted students participate in this pull-out program. In other years the entire class participated in a lab design program with the classroom teacher instructing non-targeted students.

The bilingual learning disabilities program is funded under Title I. It was designed by the school's principal with input from teachers, district personnel and staff from another school to provide intensive instruction to bilingual students who have great difficulty learning.

Students are instructed in groups of two or three every day for 45 minutes. The program is described as preventive; it seeks to help students by identifying specific learning problems and providing specific instruction while maintaining the student in his/her regular class.

School Coordination

The coordination of these programs with school instruction occurs informally. Some classroom teachers reported that they are unfamiliar with the purpose, content and instruction carried on in the special programs, unfamiliar with the criteria used for student selection, and resent having students pulled out of their classes. Another teacher reported frequent informal contact with special program teachers and the sharing of materials for classroom use. The reading teacher said that she schedules meetings once a month with classroom teachers and that she regularly communicates with classroom teachers on an informal basis.

District Coordination and Training

Coordination of classroom reading instruction and Title I reading instruction is facilitated by the district reading director, who also administers Title I. The change in emphasis toward more direct teaching of reading and a greater emphasis on reading comprehension and study skills is guided by a program designed by Title I teachers under her direction. Elementary classroom teachers for English dominant students are presently being trained in the new program. School principals were convinced of the need to train classroom teachers in techniques for teaching reading comprehension. The district superintendent and community school

board supported the staff development effort by releasing students early on several days so that classroom teachers could participate. Training in the new reading program is also being conducted for paraprofessionals. A classroom teacher and auxiliary trainer are conducting sessions for half a day each week. The new program requires a different role for the paraprofessional and deals with skills and content not previously emphasized in Title I reading labs.

Coordination of bilingual programs is influenced by a strong district-wide philosophy and a district level director. Bilingual education is for all students from kindergarten through grade 9. It is not remedial; but rather a total bilingual-bicultural orientation governing all bilingual education. Coordination from the district office of other funded programs with regular school instruction varies from program to program and depends upon the extent to which district coordinators take an interest in a particular funded program in their curriculum area. The district supports the ideas for special programs that teachers, principals or district staff design by finding resources within the district to support them, and/or by assisting them in the identification of resources not presently in the district.

Parent Advisory Council

The district PAC convenes monthly to review funded programs. It visits each program to gain first-hand knowledge of the ways that programs function in schools. In School C, parents who were interviewed, reported that many parents are in the school each day. They were

familiar with the school's programs and felt the programs were essential to the school.

Concerns

Several concerns were listed by the district's reading coordinator. She feels that there should be greater emphasis on teacher training, and time alloted for structured articulation between the program teacher and the classroom teacher. Procedures now required by the central Office of Funded Programs are inappropriate; e.g., the elaborate and time consuming procedures imposed by the central Board of Education for hiring consultants.

Coordination of classroom reading and Title I reading was facilitated by district-wide training for elementary classroom teachers in the new reading comprehension program developed by and for the district's Title I program. Bilingual education in School C is coordinated by a unifying district philosophy.

SCHOOL D

Goals

A comprehensive study of reading was conducted in this district seven years ago. Fourteen recommendations for the improvement of reading were made including the establishment of: diagnostic/prescriptive reading labs utilizing PSEN and Title I funds to serve both students and teachers; classroom reading instruction using a diagnostic/prescriptive approach; and teacher training for the management of small group instruction. Diagnostic/prescriptive, small group instruction has also been applied to math and bilingual education. The district-wide instructional focus is reflected in the goals established for the current year by the faculty in School D. Small group instruction, identification and use of diagnostic tests, development of student contracts using varied and appropriate materials, and the integration of reading, math and language skills throughout the curriculum represent an overview of their instructional goals for 1978-1979.

The school's philosophy is to meet the needs of all children on all levels. The principal said that a school needs a structure to do this. The rationale for the organization of School D is present in the following statement taken from a 1978-1979 school bulletin:

> The program of a school should reflect its educational philosophy. It should be an instrument in the implementation of its educational goals. The proper planning and execution of the program will help to provide for the special needs and interests of the pupils through curriculum, development of talents, utilization of special abilities of staff, etc. Through a variety of techniques of programming (individualized, departmentalized, small group, whole class, team approach, etc.) each of us will better understand his/her individual role in the framework of the total school organization so that through this cooperative effort the school's goals can be achieved.

School Organization

School D is a K-6 elementary school serving between 800 and 900 students. Students receive intensive reading instruction daily for approximately 50 minutes during scheduled reading periods. Class and grade lines are crossed as students are organized in small homogeneous groups, and all teachers in the building have responsibility for teaching reading during the reading period. This reorganization of students reduces the pupil/teacher ratio for reading instruction. Additional reading instruction occurs every afternoon when teachers incorporate reading skills into the content areas of social studies and science. Instruction of math for grades 3,4 and 5 utilizes a similar redistribution of students into homogeneous groups of about 15 students who receive intensive math instruction 4 - 5 times a week. Personnel included in the math program are classroom teachers, the math resource teacher, the Title I math teacher and paraprofessionals.

Supervision of instruction is divided between the principal for kindergarten through grade 2, and the assistant principal for grades 3 through 6. Administrative duties are delegated to an administrative teacher, appropriate specialist teachers and classroom teachers.

A recent study of the school by the National Study of School evaluation described the school as having an interlocking set of programs and projects that were coordinated well with school instruction because of a workable scheduling system. Special programs, school instruction and the school's programming or scheduling system are interdependent. It is difficult to talk about them separately.

Special Programs

Special programs in School D that were examined for this study were Title I reading, Title I math lab, PSEN-Title I reading lab, and the transitional class. There are two Title I reading programs in this school. One focused on reading and language development and was implemented by a teacher and paraprofessionals who work with children in their classrooms or in the Title I reading room. They worked with some targeted pupils during the departmentalized reading period and others in the afternoon when reading is taught in the content areas. The second program is a district-wide diagnostic/prescriptive reading lab learning program funded by Title I and PSEN. The classroom teacher is included in the program's target population. The entire class visits the lab together so that the classroom teacher may be taught to manage instruction in the lab. The reading teacher in conjunction with the classroom teacher develops a prescriptive contract to guide student learning of specific reading skills within a developmental reading framework. In the classroom the students continue to work on their contracts. This entire process coordinates with the district-wide staff development program that trains teachers to manage small group instruction in the classroom (see page 61 for description).

The Title I math program also uses the lab approach. Targeted students attend the math lab 4 - 5 times a week to work on specific math skills with the math resource teacher and paraprofesssionals. Additional targeted students are taught in their classrooms by a Title I math teacher

and paraprofessionals. An extension of the math program is a math lab on wheels that is available on a scheduled basis for classroom use.

The transitional class consists of 15 - 20 second grade students who were held back. One classroom teacher and one aide work with small groups and individual students intensively focusing on reading and math skills. Because of the nature of the program and the small teacher/student ratio, the students do not participate in the departmentalized reading program or Title I.

School Coordination

The interaction of special programs with school instruction occurs in many ways. In fact, special programs are completely integrated into the overall school instructional program. During the developmental reading program all personnel including the Title I reading teacher have responsibility for a segment of the school's population for reading instruction. Title I paraprofessionals under the direction of the classroom or reading teacher assist targeted students. When Title I reading and math teachers and paraprofessionals work with targeted students in classrooms, they complete a monthly outline of objectives and activities for the classroom teacher. Diagnosis and instruction in the reading lab is coordinated with ongoing classroom reading instruction. The classroom teacher accompanies the entire class to the reading lab. The lab teacher tests targeted students and develops prescriptions with the classroom teacher. The teachers and two paraprofessionals work with students in the lab on their identified skill needs. Students continue their

learning of the skills identified in the lab by completing part of their prescription in their classroom. Responsibility for diagnostic testing and prescription writing is gradually transferred to the classroom teacher.

The Title I math programs are similarly integrated into the ongoing instruction of math. However, entire classes accompanied by the classroom teacher do not attend the lab (although the Math Resource Teacher would like to implement such a plan). Also, the math teacher has set up a moveable math resource table for use by regular classroom teachers. For students who attend the math lab, a copy of each student's diagnostic profile is given to the classroom teacher. For students taught in the classroom, a monthly outline of objectives and activities is given to the classroom teacher.

Articulation between special program and classroom teachers takes place formally and informally. Some monthly staff conferences in School D are held during the lunch hour. Teachers meet in small groups with assigned facilitators to address specific issues and problems. The groups consist of classroom and special program teachers. The discussion is recorded and shared with the rest of the school. Title I reading and math teachers prepare articulation sheets each month for the classroom teacher. The reading lab teacher meets once a month with each classroom teacher in the reading lab to review student progress and jointly write student prescriptions. Classroom teachers, administrators, as well as the special program teachers themselves, all described the role of the special program teacher as one of a resource person.

Training

The district-wide program of teacher training for the management of small group instruction is being implemented in School D. As with the special programs, the staff development program funded by PSEN, is fully integrated into the overall school program. Briefly, this program trains assistant principals and teachers in classroom management of small groups and individualized instruction. Assistant principals were trained in order to facilitate the training of additional teachers in the school. A single teacher from each school was trained in a classroom management model that provides for groups of students to be engaged in different strategies of instruction: a) direct instruction, b) independent activities, c) learning centers, and d) prescriptions or contracts. Teachers are supported in efforts to organize their classrooms for small group instruction by district teacher trainers and assistant principals. Additional teachers are trained at each school by a team comprised of the district teacher trainer, the assistant principal, the initially trained classroom teacher, and the Reading lab teacher. The coordination of the PSEN staff development program with the Title I/PSEN Diagnostic Prescriptive Learning Program (Reading Lab Program) occurred at the district level (see Page 62). Within the school the integration of these two programs is realized when the classroom teacher, who attends the reading lab with his/her class, learns to diagnose reading problems, develops appropriate prescriptions for students, instructs and manages student learning in the reading laboratory, designs a classroom for small groups, individual and

independent learning, and instructs and manages student learning, using a variety of strategies and grouping patterns. All of these processes come together as a result of the coordination of the staff development program and the reading lab program.

District Coordination

The district coordinators of each program have worked together, sharing ideas and techniques and most recently have agreed to include the school reading lab teacher, who has been highly trained within the reading program in diagnoatic/prescriptive teaching, as part of the staff development training effort. There is open communication between the program directors and continuous written communication among the program participants.

At the district level there is an effort to expand the reading lab model to math and bilingual education. The reading lab program director has worked with the district bilingual coordinator to design and implement bilingual labs. Coordination of funded programs occurs at the district level when the superintendent, deputy superintendent, director of funded programsand the director PSEN jointly review the needs of the district and review proposals written by program coordinators, in order to match identified needs while supporting the district's focus on diagnoatic/ prescriptive instruction and teacher training. Individual schools are active in writing their own proposals and in making recommendations to the superintendent about district-wide proposals.

Parent Advisory Council

Proposals for district-wide funding are submitted to the PAC for recommendations and input before being sent to the Community School Board. Parent involvement in School D is extensive. Parents volunteer for classroom and school activities. In November, teachers in School D talked with 532 parents in Parent-Teacher Conferences.

Concerns

District staff expressed concerns about the different criteria used to identify PSEN and Title I target populations as being constrictive to their efforts to coordinate programs fully. A second concern is the proliferation of programs and the mountains of paperwork involved in their administration. The large number of programs with differing guidelines limits the coordination of instruction.

Special programs are an integrated part of the classroom instruction in School D. The reading and math lab programs are coordinated with classroom programs as a result of a formal articulation process, written communication, a staff development program, and the school's faculty conferences.

SCHOOL E

Goals

Literacy and improved reading achievement are the goals of District E this year. Human and material resources have been mobilized at the district level toward this end. A comprehensive plan was written by the superintendent as a temporary guide for district action. During the year each school is developing their own comprehensive plan for the improvement of reading. The plans are to include both tax levy reading and the Title I program.

School Organization

School E is a bilingual elementary school, with 600 children in grades K-6 housed in an open space facility. The school is organized in two multi-graded units. The student population is 67% Hispanic, 32%black and 1% other. There is a class for the gifted and talented on each grade level and one transitional class of first and second grade students. All students participate in reading first period and instruction in a second language the next hour. They are grouped homogeneously across grade levels for reading and second language instruction.

Special Programs

The special programs in School E are Title I and PSEN reading using a pull-out design, a Title VII bilingual program and a transitional class. PSEN is a developmental program for first and second grade using whole class instruction. Title I

serves students from grades 3-6 using a diagnostic-prescriptive pull-out design. Students with similar skill needs are grouped together cutting across grade levels. The Title VII program provides three resource teachers who demonstrate teaching techniques, disseminate materials, and teach special language arts, social studies classes and Spanish as a second language. Title VII teachers work with students selected for the gifted and talented program. The transitional class includes first and second grade students. They participate in the school-wide homogeneous grouping for reading and second language instruction. The Title VII program was designed by and for School E. The Title I/PSEN program is part of a single district-wide design.

School Coordination

At School E,coordination among special programs occurs formally as a result of the school-wide bilingual orientation and scheduling of reading and language instruction and informally through the frequent contact of program and classroom teachers. The school's physical design facilitates interaction among teachers. Classroom teachers learn about what is happening in special programs because they observe them easily without being disruptive. Time is built into the Title I schedule for joint program teacher - paraprofessional planning. Title I and PSEN teachers, however, do not have

scheduled planning time with classroom teachers. The bilingual program is not a separate program in this school. All students learn a second language, while maintaining proficiency in their native language.

Training

Staff development is a vehicle being used by the district to help schools improve reading achievement. In an extensive memo sent to all of the district's principals in October 1978, the reading coordinator outlined the focus and procedures to upgrade the teaching of reading. The memo directed each school to form a reading team, to designate one person to be responsible for implementing a reading program in the school, and to develop an on-going monitoring system. The memo describes district responsibilities to include staff development of the designated key reading teachers, the distribution of materials to be used by key reading teachers to conduct workshops in their schools, technical assistance to schools, and a monitoring system for principals to evaluate the program. Training of principals has been conducted this year in two areas. The superintendent and two deputy superintendents are visiting schools to train principals in observation techniques useful in teacher supervision. A different school is visited each day by each of the three chief administrators. Also, principals requested training in bilingual education. Two days of training has been conducted in concepts, strategies and materials of

bilingual education.

The Title I program conducted five days of training before the opening of school for all of its teachers and aides. Training for funded program staff is ongoing during the year with monthly district meetings and assistance from coordinators in the schools.

District Coordination

The district office has influenced program implementation in several ways in order to achieve improved reading. First, the training described in the previous paragraphs was designed to support the reading program. Second, the district submitted a unified Title I program proposal. In the past Title I funds have come to the district through the funding of several different Title I programs. The new proposal provides for a single comprehensive reading program. Third, responsibility for administration in the district has been distributed among the deputy superintendents. The schools are grouped into clusters for frequent and direct communication. Each deputy superintendent has horizontal and vertical responsibilities. The Deputy Superintendent for Instruction administers all areas of the curriculum and has responsibility for all funded programs. Fourth, the district has also funded mini-grants this year to support individual classroom teachers who want to try new strategies or instructional models and need some additional resources.

Concerns

The major concern of the district is to allow Title I funds to be used to help support the comprehensive plan in each school rather than to maintain a separate program.

The emphasis on improved reading is being supported by action within the school and at the district level. The force for change is eminating from the superintendent. Schools are being visited frequently, principals are expected to supervise teachers frequently, schools are developing comprehensive plans to improve reading at the request of the superintendent and a reading teacher from each school is being trained to help implement a comprehensive reading program.

SCHOOL F

School Organization

School F is organized with self-contained classrooms where students are homogeneously grouped by reading level. It serves 33 elementary classes (K-6)and 7 health conservation classes. There are seven classes for bilingual students distributed across the grades and one transitional class serves grades 1, 2 and 3. The administration of the school is distributed among the principal and two assistant principals. The supervision of grades K-2 and an early education program (Title I) is delegated to one assistant principal. Grades 4-6, the Title I reading program and the PSEN classes are assigned to the second assistant principal. The district's Title VII director is housed in the school and coordinates bilingual education. The schcol's programming is divided into 45 minute blocks of time. A building-wide schedule for coverage and lunch is developed by the administration. Schedules for the students participating in special programs are developed by the program coordinators with input from classroom teachers. Schedules for classroom instruction are developed by individual teachers.

Special Programs

On each grade level, the class of lowest reading ability is served by Title I and PSEN. The classroom teacher works with targeted students in the classroom when Title I reading teachers work with Title I targeted students in a separate room. In both programs, students are instructed in specific skills that they are lacking. A developmental reading program is given by the classroom teacher to all students. One of the Title I reading programs is a High Intensity

Learning System (HILS) reading center serving the older children. The lab uses a management system for diagnostic/prescriptive teaching of skills and emphasizes the reading of books. There are student-teacher conferences to discuss readings. The design of a second Title I reading program serving the early grades has paraprofessionals working with students in small groups in their classroom and/or reading teachers working with targeted students in a reading room. A reading teacher for bilingual students funded by Title I instructs students in specific reading skills for English. Students are pulled-out to form homogenous groups for instruction. A pilot ESAA program serves a population of 3rd, 4th and 5th graders in an individualized reading lab.

School Coordination

At the school level, classroom teachers report that articulation with special program teachers occurs informally. Planning times do not coincide nor are there any regularly scheduled times for teachers to plan together or discuss student progress. The bilingual reading teacher spends some time in students' classrooms on specific days to reinforce reading instruction in the classroom. The several bilingual programs in the school all work toward the same goal, i.e., to improve a student's ability to communicate and speak in English while maintaining his/her proficiency in Spanish. The presence of the District Title VII bilingual director enhances the coordination of bilingual education in School F.

District Coordination

The district coordinates its array of funded programs by convening

monthly meetings of all tax levy and reimbursable program directors. One outcome of these meetings is a coordinated testing program. In order to avoid duplication of testing, the district has initiated uniform testing procedures for all reimbursable reading and math programs. All students are tested in their classrooms with assistance of special program staff. The instruments for identifying targeted students are designated for each grade. A student record card has been developed to show participation in funded programs. The card is transferred within the district when students move to another school.

Responsibility for transitional classes was placed with the coordinator of the early childhood Title I program. Training of transitional class teachers has been conducted each month under her direction. It was felt that transitional teachers are eligible for Title I training because they are teaching a population of targeted Title I students.

Bilingual directors are located in the same office and coordinate training, staffing needs and resources. They also call upon district curriculum staff as resource persons for the bilingual teachers who teach math, science and social studies.

Training

Each funded program has a district staff of teacher trainers and a director. Some training of program teachers is planned collaboratively among the Title I, ESAA and PSEN directors. Four combined training sessions are being held this year. To supplement these meetings the ESAA coordinator is distributing a series of packets of written materials that

discuss specific areas of reading skills. Most training is given by funded program teacher trainers in the school. They meet with individual or small groups of teachers. Schools rely on district programs staffs and program teachers for assistance in selecting materials and getting current information about reading techniques.

Concerns

The following concerns were voiced by district personnel. 1) It is feared that reimbursable programs are controlling regular schooling. 2) The state requirement that a district key punch all test data is prohibitively expensive for a district. 3) There is a lack of uniformity in policy from the state. 4) Reading is too narrowly defined; reading in the content area is not acceptable to the SED because instruction is too difficult to identify and trace for auditing purposes. 5) Classroom assistance for targeted students is preferred to the pull-out model.

In School F, coordination of bilingual education is facilitated by the district's Title VII director supervising all bilingual teachers. PSEN services are delivered by the teacher to targeted students. Articulation among teachers consists of informally held discussions about students and programs. Coordination of the many funded programs at the district office occurs through regularly held meetings of all program coordinators. Many members of the district staff reported that sharing and coordination is ongoing and informal among the directors of the various remedial reading programs.

SCHOOL G

Goals

Independent learning, mastery learning and future studies are three themes or foci for instruction in School G. Skills for independent learning such as library usage, outlining, and research are taught as students engage in contracts that guide their study in a topic of their choice. Students have scheduled time in the library and the learning center. The completed contract is reviewed with the student's teacher and parents. Mastery learning has been introduced this year for students on or below grade level. Students are frequently tested on skills and concepts and are retaught any part of the English, Social Studies or Math unit in which they score below 80% mastery. Future studies have become part of the curriculum at School G because of the principal's interest in science. Students study concepts such as ecology, cloning, and aging as they complete contracts in Science, Math, Social Scudies and English that have a future theme. Some special funds for the future studies were secured from the state. The school has also written several mini grants and a proposal to use solar energy for school heating.

School Organization and Special Programs

School G is an intermediate school, grades 6-9, consisting of 44 classes homogeneously grouped within grade levels by reading achievement. The school is departmentalized and has three assistant principals with vertical and horizontal responsibilities. Students attend classes as they are grouped for homeroom. A parallel program for reading instruction provides those students in need of reading instruction with five extra

periods of English each week. Students who are targeted for Title I or ESAA attend a reading lab for their supplementary reading program. At the same time, English teachers give reading instruction to the non-targeted students in their classroom. Students in need of reading instruction participate in the school's full schedule of activities but have fewer periods of health and shop and they do not take typing. The principal is quick to point out that by increasing the language arts instruction to ten periods a week, reading achievement has increased. Over the last three years, the percentage of students reading on or above grade level has increased from 40% to 50.3%, and the number of students reading two or more years below grade level has decreased from 30% to 14%. Instruction for students who attend the reading labs is funded by Title I and ESAA. Computers are used to design prescriptions for student individualized instruction. The computer management system was selected by the school's principal for the reading lab program.

Bilingual education for Spanish and Italian speaking students is funded by Title I, PSEN and Title VII. Students are instructed in their native language for math, science and social studies and receive English instruction with an ESL teacher two periods a day. They also attend gym, shop and art classes. Each language group also receives instruction in language arts in his native language. All bilingual education is coordinated by a supervisor. Teachers attend monthly staff meetings together with the foreign language teachers. The ESL teachers plan with the bilingual teachers twice a week. Subject area teachers who instruct bilingual students send a written daily report to the bilingual teacher describing

special events or problems of groups or individual students.

School Coordination

Articulation between the reading lab program and the English teachers occurs informally. There is some joint planning time, but the English teachers reported that they meet with the reading lab teachers only as the need arises. Copies of student diagnostic profiles and instructional prescriptions are given to English teachers twice a year. Reading teachers attend staff conferences with the English department. One assistant principal supervises all special programs and school-wide testing.

District Coordination and Training

District level planning for special programs is coordinated by the superintendent and director of funded programs. Considering the needs of each school, staff and resources are allocated to implement district-wide programs coordinated by curriculum directors in each subject area. Proposals are developed with informal consultation from school principals and curriculum directors. The district PAC reviews funded program proposals before they are submitted to the community school board.

A bilingual coordinator at the district office facilitates unified bilingual education using the resources of Title I, PSEN, tax levy and Title VII. Materials are shared and

coordinated with English language subject area instructors. Monthly meetings are held for all bilingual teachers in the district and training is conducted at schools by teacher trainers and with tuition-paid college courses. District curriculum directors for reading and math administer funded programs, conduct monthly teacher meetings and consult with school principals and teachers about the selection of instructional materials. The use of math labs in this district's schools is being expanded so that classroom teachers may bring their entire class to the lab for supplementary instruction. The district's math director is training regular teachers in the management of instruction in a lab setting.

Parent Advisory Council

Parents are active in School G in fund raising activities and as school volunteers. There is a large Parents Association with which the principal meets each month. Title I parents are invited to observe their children 3 or 4 times during the year and make suggestions for program improvement.

Concerns

The district staff expressed concern about the drain on time and money for program evaluation data, resources that would be better spent on instruction. The school's bilingual students cannot make use of the learning center because of the lack of Spanish and Italian language audio instructional

materials. More resources are needed to provide parallel learning materials for bilingual students.

Supplementary reading instruction is given to students who need it regardless of their status with respect to funded program criteria for student selection. In addition to the language arts instruction given to all students in School G, students with low reading ability are given reading instruction. Students targeted for Title I or ESAA programs receive reading instruction in a reading lab. Non-targeted students receive instruction from their English teacher. Both programs have low teacher-student ratios and use individualized instruction. The reading lab uses a computerized diagnostic/prescriptive management system. Copies of student profiles are given to the English teachers. The bilingual program is coordinated in School G so that instruction is consistent regardless of the program funding source. ESL teachers meet with the bilingual teachers twice a week and there is daily written communication between subject area and bilingual teachers.

SCHOOL H

Goals

District goals are developed with input from the teaching staff, school principals, district staff, PTA, and community school board. The goals are presented to the school board each year. This year, the district's focus is on Values Education in addition to maintaining the priorities of reading, math, bilingual and career education. In addition to district goals, each school develops a set of goals which are published with city and district goal statements in a booklet for district-wide distribution. The goals developed by School H include coordinating career education with language arts and social studies instruction, intensifying instruction in oral and written communication skills, expanding foreign language instruction and bilingual/bicultural education into more grade levels, teaching good health practices, and stressing problem solving in mathematics instruction.

School Organization

School H is an elementary school of 42 classes including 5 bilingual classes and 1 transitional class. Students are homogeneously grouped and receive instruction in self contained classes except for those students who participate in reading and math supplementary programs and ESL instruction. A schedule for school-wide activities is developed by the principal. Reading, math and ESL teachers develop schedules

for their participating students in such a way as to have students for reading and language programs pulled-out at the same time.

Special Programs

Special programs at School H include corrective reading which is funded by Title I, PSEN and ESAA, corrective math funded by Title I and PSEN, ESL instruction funded by PSEN and tax levy, a Title VII resource teacher funded, in part, by tax levy, and a transitional class for 2nd or 3rd graders. With the exception of the transitional class, the special programs have been part of School H for several years and are reviewed and revised, as needed, by a school standing committee of teachers, coordinators and the principal. The corrective reading and math programs are diagnostic/prescriptive using homogeneous small group and individual instruction by grade level. The ESL instruction focuses on language development skills and students are grouped by ability across grade and age levels.

School and District Coordination and Training

Within the school, articulation occurs informally as needed and during faculty conferences. There are no common planning periods nor formalized coordination procedures. Coordination at the district level occurs as administration for the corrective reading and math programs and bilingual programs

are assigned to district curriculum coordinators. District-wide staff development for classroom teachers also contributes to greater understanding of an articulation and coordination with special programs. One classroom teacher who was interviewed reported attending a three-day Title I funded workshop on diagnostic/prescriptive techniques and materials for teaching math. The district supported a college credit course for classroom teachers in diagnostic/prescriptive teaching of reading attended by 21 teachers last year. A second classroom teacher reported that she attended a 5 day district training program for classroom teachers on Values Education that was funded by ESAA.

The district found that training classroom teachers was effective in implementing career education. The training model is being replicated to help integrate values education with classroom instruction. The model has four major components. First, school principals are intensively trained in the program. Second, a classroom teacher is trained from each school and then becomes the liaison person for the program, the resource person for the school and the trainer for other school staff. Third, classroom teachers develop the curriculum materials, lesson plans and resources for the program. Fourth, a resource center is established in the district to help maintain the program and support school implementation. The values education program this year has included training for district

staff and parents, as well as teachers and principals. A third training program funded by the National Science Foundation provides university training for science teachers implementing a new science curriculum.

Concerns

District and school staff who were interviewed said that reading problems must be found early and that the 3rd grade seems to be a turning point for many students. A concern of the ESL teachers was that results of the city's language testing had not been returned (the test was given in September and these interviews were conducted in March), and final testing was to be conducted in March, too early in the school year to show maximum progress.

Staff development training in this district is used to support implementation of programs that are designed to achieve district-wide goals. The training begins with school principals and then focuses on teacher training. A single teacher is trained to implement the program in the school, assist other teachers, and distribute resources. Also, classroom teachers develop instructional materials for district-wide use.

SCHOOL I

Goals

High expectations are set by School I for its students. An equally important and often mentioned theme is the school's intent to foster student self worth and encourage the development of a positive self-image. The discussion at a recent faculty meeting centered around the statement: "We cannot help outside factors very much, but we can help students learn!"

School Organization

Nine hundred students from pre-kindergarten through grade 5 attend School I. They are heterogeneously grouped within grade levels and instructed in self-contained classes except for supplementary reading and math classes. Students participate in only one of these programs and their participation is coordinated so that students are pulled-out at the same time.

Special Programs

There are three reading lab programs and one math lab. Students targeted for Title I reading participate 4 or 5 times a week for a total of 225 minutes. Reading and math teachers are charged with doing something different in supplementary programs from what students receive in classroom instruction. One lab serves second grade students using the published supplementary materials coordinated with their basal reading

program. A second lab serves third and fourth grade students. This program uses a diagnostic/prescriptive design. Students concentrate on needed skills and reading for comprehension and enjoyment. The third Title I class for 5th grade students is a High Intensity Learning System (HILS) lab. (See description of program in School A Case Study). The math lab was developed from a diagnostic-prescriptive arithmetic program developed by the Title I math coordinator in another district and disseminated with the support of Title III. The Title I math teacher in School I has received additional funds for instructional materials as part of a state replication award given to the school's math lab. It is designated as a training site for other math teachers.

School Coordination

Teachers in School I discuss student progress and programs informally, as needed. Each reading teacher meets with only one or two grade levels and finds that classroom teachers are supportive of their programs. The third/fourth grade reading teacher reports in writing to classroom teachers listing the skills and activities their students work on each month. The fifth grade classroom teachers are invited to observe their students function in the HILS lab. Both classroom teachers and reading teachers reported that the Title I staff members in School I are resource teachers for the school's faculty.

Training

Teacher training for the Title I reading and math teachers is conducted by district coordinators once a month. Paraprofessionals are included in these meetings. Classroom teachers are being trained as part of the Title I math program in testing and teaching techniques and the design of instructional materials. As a result of the training of classroom teachers, there has been increased interest in the operation of the math and reading labs. Articulation and coordination between classroom and math lab instruction has improved. A fifth grade teacher reported that the training was extremely useful and she was looking forward to additional workshops later this year. Classroom teachers have been released for these workshops by hiring substitute teachers. However, the district policy is that most classroom teacher training is to be conducted by school principals during grade conferences and faculty meetings.

Proposal development for district-wide programs is conducted by district coordinators for Title I reading, math and bilingual programs. The PSEN program is designed by the deputy superintendent to coordinate with tax levy instruction. District workshops for proposal development for competitive funding is held to assist principals with individual school program design. The community school board maintains a three-member subcommittee for funded programs which meets monthly to review and discuss programs and conduct public hearings.

Parent Advisory Council

Parent participation in program development occurs through the district PAC. Monthly meetings are conducted to review programs, discuss options and visit and observe classrooms. The district PAC approves proposals prior to their submission to the community school board.

Concerns

District concerns focus on the issue of supplanting. Students are instructed in pull-out programs so that services to the targeted students may be easily audited. It was pointed out that students who participate in special programs tend to remain in a school. Parents are more reluctant to take a child out of a school once the child has entered a special program. When placing programs in a school, three things must be considered:

1. The principal is the key person. He or she must be enthusiastic, knowledgeable and in favor of bringing about change in the school.
2. Each school should have only a moderate number of special programs.
3. What will the program bring to the overall instruction of the child?

The coordination of mathematics instruction is improving in School I as a result of training conducted for classroom

teachers in the techniques and materials used in the Title I math lab. A reading lab teacher in School I reports monthly to the classroom teacher the skills students are learning in the Title I reading program. By design, the special programs in School I are to be different from classroom instruction.

SCHOOL J

School Organization and Special Programs

School J is an elementary school, grades K-5, organized into twenty-three self-contained classes, including one transitional class for third graders. There are also five special education classes. The school's schedule provides common planning for grade level teachers. Special programs in the school include Title I reading and math and PSEN reading. The reading and math teachers assisted by a paraprofessional work with small groups of targeted students in a pull-out diagnostic/prescriptive program four days a week. Also, available for use by the school is a jointly sponsored (district-PSEN - university) reading diagnostic center that provides students with a complete diagnostic work-up.

Students displaying severe reading difficulties in the 3rd, 4th or 5th grades participate in a five week program of testing and clinical teaching at the university. Parents are involved in the process and must be responsible for the child's transportation. A liaison teacher arranges schedules, contacts parents, and reports back to the classroom teacher, discusses the findings, and suggests ideas to help the child in the regular classroom.

The services of the reading clinic were made available to the students in the transitional classes this year. Visual and auditory screening were conducted by the clinic and the

liaison teacher conducted training sessions for the transitional teachers. The transitional classes are organized similarly to Title I reading rooms with a center-like arrangement for small group and individual instruction. To assist the transitional teacher, the Title I - PSEN coordinator held workshops and facilitated the exchange of materials.

The Title I reading teacher in School J serves second and third grade targeted students. The PSEN reading teacher serves targeted students in grades 4 and 5. Comprehension skills are emphasized in the upper grades with students working independently at their own level. The small group provides opportunity for frequent teacher-student interaction.

The Title I diagnostic/prescriptive arithmetic program has been validated for national dissemination under Title III. Diagnostic tests have been developed by the district's math coordinator. Regular classroom teachers in the district are being trained in administering and analyzing tests, grouping students who need instruction on particular skills, and designing instruction to focus on student individual needs. The program emphasizes the use of noncommercial, teacher-made manipulative materials. The math program was developed in an attempt to diagnose problems better and teach Title I children, Its Title III status promotes the training of administrators and classroom teachers as well as Title I teachers, resulting in better continuity between the Title I math program and

ongoing math instruction in the classroom.

School and District Coordination

Coordination between classroom reading instruction and Title I reading programs is facilitated in this district by the reading coordinator, who is responsible for classroom and special reading programs. She administers the Title I and PSEN programs, conducts joint monthly workshops for the funded teachers in these programs, and assists school principals in selecting new reading materials for classroom use. Title IV-B funding extends the Title I reading design into the regular classrooms of grades 3, 4 and 5. One teacher from each grade level is assisted in administering a diagnostic instrument in order to group students for skills instruction. Title IV-B funds are used to purchase audio/viewing equipment for classroom listening centers. At these centers, small groups of students receive reinforcement in the skills introduced by the classroom teacher. Teachers and students from other classes are gradually introduced to the learning center equipment and share in its use.

Coordination of the reading clinic program and the classroom situation is built into the program design. A clinic liaison teacher reports the findings to the student's teacher and suggests activities and strategies for classroom use. Articulation of Title I and PSEN teachers in School J occurs informally as the need arises. Special program teachers discuss

student progress with classroom teachers and include comments on the student's report card. Conferences are held with parents as needed, and during scheduled teacher conference days.

Parent Advisory Council

The school PAC works closely with the principal. A parent member who was interviewed said that the school PAC influences school programming. The District PAC meets with school principals to discuss new programs.

Concerns

The major concern about Title I and PSEN programs is that they must be pull-out programs. Parents, teachers and administrators all expressed the feeling that this is an objectionable aspect of the program. Although the district and school assign students to only one reading program, the same students may be participating in math and bilingual pull-out programs. A second concern of parents was the summer program. It requires massive testing and there is insufficient instructional time. A third concern of teachers and parents was the extreme delay the special programs have in starting each year. Initial testing may extend into December.

District J coordinates the instruction of math between Title I and the regular classroom through the resources of its Title III dissemination grant that provides for the training

of classroom teachers. The Title I reading design of small group instruction, based on diagnosis and prescription is being extended into some classrooms, as workshops are conducted for PSEN and Title I reading teachers to share ideas and discuss issues and problems, facilitating a coordination of the PSEN and Title I programs.

"END OF DOCUMENT"